

REMARKS

The specification has been amended to recite correct cross-reference information. It is submitted that no new matter has been introduced by the foregoing amendments. Approval and entry of the amendments is respectfully solicited.

Objection

The specification was objected to because the serial number 07/329,900 and the corresponding patent number 6,394,317 listed in the cross reference to related applications was incorrect. (Paper No. 03202004 ("Office Action") at 2. The Examiner's careful reading of this section of the specification is most appreciated. The Cross-Reference to Related Applications has been amended in view of the Examiner's comments. It is intended that this objection is now moot and should be withdrawn.

Obviousness Rejection

Claims 14-17 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over US Pat. No. 4,552,899 ("Sunshine") (Office Action at 3.)

For the reasons set forth below the rejection, respectfully is traversed.

Claims 14-17 were canceled in the June 26,2003 Preliminary Amendment. Therefore, it is believed that this rejection is moot and should be withdrawn.

Statutory Type Double Patenting

Claims 1-11 and 13 were rejected under 35 USC § 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 1-11 and 13 of US Pat. No. 6,211,246. (Office Action at 5.)

For the reasons set forth below the rejection, respectfully is traversed.

Claims 1-11 and 13 were canceled in the June 26,2003 Preliminary Amendment. Therefore, it is believed that this rejection is moot and should be withdrawn.

Non-Statutory Type Double Patenting

Claims 12 was rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 12 of US Pat. No. 6,211,246. (Office Action at 5.)

For the reasons set forth below the rejection, respectfully is traversed.

Claim 12 was canceled in the June 26,2003 Preliminary Amendment. Therefore, it is believed that this rejection is moot and should be withdrawn.

Finally, the Examiner is invited to call the applicants' undersigned representative if any further action will expedite the prosecution of the application or if the Examiner has any suggestions or questions concerning the application or the present Response. In fact, if the claims of the application are not believed to be in full condition for allowance, for any reason, the applicants respectfully request the constructive assistance and suggestions of the Examiner in drafting one or more acceptable claims pursuant to MPEP § 707.07(j) or in making constructive suggestions pursuant to MPEP § 706.03 so that the application can be placed in allowable condition as soon as possible and without the need for further proceedings.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 
Timothy E. Tracy
Reg. No. 39,401

Johnson & Johnson
One Johnson & Johnson Plaza
New Brunswick, NJ 08933-7003
(732) 524-6586
DATE: July 26, 2004